identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

B5

Date: MAY 14 2012 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER FILE: [redacted]

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of $630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a technology company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a system architect. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition. The director denied the petition accordingly.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed, timely and makes a specific allegation of error in law or fact. The procedural history in this case is documented by the record and incorporated into the decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

As set forth in the director's February 2, 2010 denial, the primary issue in this case is whether the petitioner has the ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence.

Section 203(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b), states in pertinent part:

> (2) Aliens Who Are Members of the Professions Holding Advanced Degrees or Aliens of Exceptional Ability. --
>
> > (A) In General. -- Visas shall be made available . . . to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or their equivalent or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business, will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States, and whose services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business are sought by an employer in the United States.

As a threshold matter, it has not been established that the petition is accompanied by an individual labor certification from the DOL which pertains to the proffered position. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(i); 20 C.F.R. § 656.30(c). The original employer identified in the Form ETA 750 is I3 Technologies, Inc. The petitioner is Incoda Corporation. The only way for the petitioning corporation to be able to use a Form ETA 750 approved for a different employer is if the petitioner establishes that it is a successor-in-interest to I3 Technologies, Inc. *Matter of Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 481 (Comm. 1986).

A petitioner may establish a valid successor relationship for immigration purposes if it satisfies three conditions. First, the petitioning successor must fully describe and document the transaction transferring ownership of all, or a relevant part of, the beneficiary's predecessor employer. Second, the petitioning successor must demonstrate that the job opportunity is the same as originally offered

on the labor certification. Third, the petitioning successor must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it is eligible for the immigrant visa in all respects.

Evidence of transfer of ownership must show that the successor not only purchased assets from the predecessor, but also the essential rights and obligations of the predecessor necessary to carry on the business. To ensure that the job opportunity remains the same as originally certified, the successor must continue to operate the same type of business as the predecessor, in the same metropolitan statistical area and the essential business functions must remain substantially the same as before the ownership transfer. *See id.* at 482.

In order to establish eligibility for the immigrant visa in all respects, the petitioner must support its claim with all necessary evidence, including evidence of ability to pay. The petitioning successor must prove the predecessor's ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and until the date of transfer of ownership to the successor. In addition, the petitioner must establish the successor's ability to pay the proffered wage in accordance from the date of transfer of ownership forward. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2); *see also Matter of Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. at 482.

In this matter, the record is devoid of evidence establishing that the petitioner is a successor-in-interest to [redacted] The petitioner claims that it "restructured" and that, because the petitioner now "directly handle[s] all its own HR activities," it seeks to replace [redacted] as the employer. The petitioner also emphasizes that both [redacted] and the petitioner are owned and controlled by the same individual. However, common ownership and control does not permit employers to transfer certified job opportunities and approved labor certifications among business organizations unless it is also established that this occurred in the context of the formation of a bona fide successor-in-interest relationship through consolidation, amalgamation, or the transfer of assets and liabilities. No such evidence has been submitted in this matter. Accordingly, the AAO will dismiss the appeal for this additional reason. The petition is not accompanied by an individual labor certification from the DOL which pertains to the proffered position. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(i); 20 C.F.R. § 656.30(c).

Regardless, even assuming that a successor-in-interest relationship had been established, the petitioner has failed to establish its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage to the beneficiary.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2) states in pertinent part:

> *Ability of prospective employer to pay wage.* Any petition filed by or for an employment-based immigrant which requires an offer of employment must be accompanied by evidence that the prospective United States employer has the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner must demonstrate this ability at the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. Evidence of this ability shall be either in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements.

The petitioner must demonstrate the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage beginning on the priority date, which is the date the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d). The petitioner must also demonstrate that, on the priority date, the beneficiary had the qualifications stated on its Form ETA 750 as certified by the DOL and submitted with the instant petition. *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

Here, the Form ETA 750 was accepted on March 4, 2003. The proffered wage as stated on the Form ETA 750 is $90,000 per year. The Form ETA 750 states that the position requires a master's degree, or foreign academic equivalent, in computer science/applications, two-years training in systems integration and internet security and five years of experience in the job offered.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.[1]

The evidence in the record of proceeding indicates that the petitioner is structured as a limited liability company. On the petition, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 2001, to have a gross annual income of $1,200,000, and to currently employ 6 workers.

The petitioner must establish that its job offer to the beneficiary is a realistic one. Because the filing of a Form ETA 750 establishes a priority date for any immigrant petition later based on the Form ETA 750, the petitioner must establish that the job offer was realistic as of the priority date and that the offer remained realistic for each year thereafter, until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. The petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage is an essential element in evaluating whether a job offer is realistic. *See Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2). In evaluating whether a job offer is realistic, USCIS requires the petitioner to demonstrate financial resources sufficient to pay the beneficiary's proffered wages, although the totality of the circumstances affecting the petitioning business will be considered if the evidence warrants such consideration. *See Matter of Sonegawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg. Comm. 1967).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage during a given period, USCIS will first examine whether the petitioner employed and paid the beneficiary during that period. If the petitioner establishes by documentary evidence that it employed the beneficiary at a salary equal to or greater than the proffered wage, the evidence will be considered *prima facie* proof of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

Although the petitioner submitted Forms W-2 which purportedly represent the payment of wages by the petitioner to the beneficiary, these Forms W-2 are from a business organization called

---

[1] The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1). The record in the instant case provides no reason to preclude consideration of any of the documents newly submitted on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).

[redacted] Although it appears that [redacted] may have been processing payroll for the companies controlled by the petitioner's owner, it has not been established that these wage payments originated with the petitioner, [redacted] These wage payments could have originated from a different business entity controlled by the petitioner's owner or some other third party. Absent evidence tracing these wage payments to the petitioner, these Forms W-2 do not establish the payment of any wages by [redacted] the petitioner herein, or any alleged predecessor-in-interest. Because a corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders, the assets of its shareholders or of other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. *See Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm'r 1980). The court in *Sitar v. Ashcroft*, 2003 WL 22203713 (D.Mass. Sept. 18, 2003) stated, "nothing in the governing regulation, 8 C.F.R. § 204.5, permits [USCIS] to consider the financial resources of individuals or entities who have no legal obligation to pay the wage." Regardless, these Forms W-2 do not show the payment of the full proffered wage to the beneficiary:[2]

Year	Beneficiary's actual Compensation	Proffered wage	Wage increase needed to pay the proffered wage
2009	$94,786.53	$90,000	$0
2008	$41,603.47	$90,000	$48,396.53
2007	$53,516[3]	$90,000	$36,484
2006	$77,916	$90,000	$12,084
2005	$66,933.36	$90,000	$23,066.64
2004	$48,000	$90,000	$42,000
2003	$28,850	$90,000	$61,150

Therefore, even assuming that these wages can be attributed to the petitioner, the petitioner must establish that it can pay the difference between the wages actually paid to the beneficiary and the proffered wage from 2003 through 2008.

If, as in this case, the petitioner has not established that it paid the beneficiary an amount at least equal to the proffered wage during the required period, USCIS will next examine the net income

---

[2] The petitioner claims that performance-based incentives should be considered as wages. The AAO will not include performance-based incentives in calculating the beneficiary's wages. Wages may not be based on commissions, bonuses, or other incentives, unless the employer guarantees a prevailing wage that equals or exceeds the prevailing wage. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 656.20(c)(3). Accordingly, the AAO will only consider the wages paid to the beneficiary as reported on the Forms W-2 submitted into evidence.

[3] As the petitioner did not submit any evidence corroborating its claim to have paid wages to the beneficiary in 2007 or 2008, the AAO will not accept these wages for this additional reason. The wages are listed here for the sake of argument, as are all of the wages given the lack of evidence connecting the wage payments to [redacted]

figure reflected on the petitioner's federal income tax return, without consideration of depreciation or other expenses. *River Street Donuts, LLC v. Napolitano*, 558 F.3d 111 (1st Cir. 2009); *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d 873 (E.D. Mich. 2010), *aff'd*, No. 10-1517 (6th Cir. filed Nov. 10, 2011). Reliance on federal income tax returns as a basis for determining a petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage is well established by judicial precedent. *Elatos Restaurant Corp. v. Sava*, 632 F. Supp. 1049, 1054 (S.D.N.Y. 1986) (*citing Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman*, 736 F.2d 1305 (9th Cir. 1984)); *see also Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh*, 719 F. Supp. 532 (N.D. Texas 1989); *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 623 F. Supp. 1080 (S.D.N.Y. 1985); *Ubeda v. Palmer*, 539 F. Supp. 647 (N.D. Ill. 1982), *aff'd*, 703 F.2d 571 (7th Cir. 1983). Reliance on the petitioner's gross receipts and wage expense is misplaced. Showing that the petitioner's gross receipts exceeded the proffered wage is insufficient. Similarly, showing that the petitioner paid wages in excess of the proffered wage is insufficient.

In *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 623 F. Supp. at 1084, the court held that the Immigration and Naturalization Service, now USCIS, had properly relied on the petitioner's net income figure, as stated on the petitioner's corporate income tax returns, rather than the petitioner's gross income. The court specifically rejected the argument that USCIS should have considered income before expenses were paid rather than net income. *See Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d at 881 (gross profits overstate an employer's ability to pay because it ignores other necessary expenses).

With respect to depreciation, the court in *River Street Donuts* noted:

> The AAO recognized that a depreciation deduction is a systematic allocation of the cost of a tangible long-term asset and does not represent a specific cash expenditure during the year claimed. Furthermore, the AAO indicated that the allocation of the depreciation of a long-term asset could be spread out over the years or concentrated into a few depending on the petitioner's choice of accounting and depreciation methods. Nonetheless, the AAO explained that depreciation represents an actual cost of doing business, which could represent either the diminution in value of buildings and equipment or the accumulation of funds necessary to replace perishable equipment and buildings. Accordingly, the AAO stressed that even though amounts deducted for depreciation do not represent current use of cash, neither does it represent amounts available to pay wages.
>
> We find that the AAO has a rational explanation for its policy of not adding depreciation back to net income. Namely, that the amount spent on a long term tangible asset is a "real" expense.

River Street Donuts at 118. "[USCIS] and judicial precedent support the use of tax returns and the *net income figures* in determining petitioner's ability to pay. Plaintiffs' argument that these figures should be revised by the court by adding back depreciation is without support." *Chi-Feng Chang* at 537 (emphasis added).

In this case, the record is wholly devoid of evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. The record does not contain any tax returns or audited financial statements pertaining to the petitioner, [redacted] Although the record contains some tax returns pertaining to the alleged predecessor-in-interest, the record does not establish the existence of a successor-in-interest relationship or, even if one exists, when this transfer in responsibility occurred. Therefore, again for sake of argument, the AAO will consider the alleged predecessor's tax returns, which do not establish an ability to pay the wage in any event.

For a C corporation, USCIS considers net income to be the figure shown on Line 28 of the Form 1120, U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return. The record before the director closed on February 2, 2010 with the director's denial. As of that date, the predecessor's 2007 federal income tax return was the most recent return available.

The predecessor's tax returns show its net income as detailed in the table below.

Year	Net Income
2007	-$359
2006	-$22,337
2005	-$62,411
2004	-$124,184
2003	-$88,147

The petitioner has not established that the predecessor had sufficient net income to pay the full proffered wage for each of the relevant years. Therefore, USCIS will review net current assets.

Net current assets are the difference between the petitioner's current assets and current liabilities.[4] A corporation's year-end current assets are shown on Schedule L, lines 1 through 6. Its year-end current liabilities are shown on lines 16 through 18. If the total of a corporation's end-of-year net current assets and the wages paid to the beneficiary (if any) are equal to or greater than the proffered wage, it is expected that the enterprise will be able to pay the proffered wage using those net current assets.

The tax returns demonstrate its end-of-year net current assets as shown in the following table.

[4] According to *Barron's Dictionary of Accounting Terms* 117 (3rd ed. 2000), "current assets" consist of items having (in most cases) a life of one year or less, such as cash, marketable securities, inventory and prepaid expenses. "Current liabilities" are obligations payable (in most cases) within one year, such accounts payable, short-term notes payable, and accrued expenses (such as taxes and salaries). *Id.* at 118.

Year	Net Current Assets
2007	$26,425
2006	$17,947
2005	$34,520
2004	$10,360
2003	$2,901

Even assuming the applicability of the tax returns and the wages paid to the instant petition, the predecessor's net current assets were insufficient to pay the difference between the wages actually paid to the beneficiary and the proffered wage in 2003, 2004, and 2007.

On appeal, counsel states that the assets of [redacted] a related entity, and the sole owner, should be used in determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. However, once again, because a corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners and shareholders, the assets of its shareholders or of other enterprises or corporations cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. *See Matter of Aphrodite Investments, Ltd.*, 17 I&N Dec. 530; *Sitar v. Ashcroft*, 2003 WL 22203713 (D.Mass. Sept. 18, 2003).

Counsel's final argument is that the petitioner's subcontract with [redacted] constitutes a liquid asset and is evidence of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. Counsel's reliance on this asset (or expense as asset) without taking into consideration the petitioner's current liabilities, is misplaced. The petitioner's assets must be balanced by the petitioner's current liabilities for each tax year. This contract also has no relevance in evaluating the petitioner's ability to pay the wage since the priority date.

Since the petitioner has not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the priority date through an examination of wages paid to the beneficiary, or its net income or net current assets, USCIS may consider the overall magnitude of the petitioner's business activities in its determination of the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage. *See Matter of Sonegawa,* 12 I&N Dec. 612.

The petitioning entity in *Sonegawa* had been in business for over 11 years and routinely earned a gross annual income of about $100,000. During the year in which the petition was filed in that case, the petitioner changed business locations and paid rent on both the old and new locations for five months. There were large moving costs and also a period of time when the petitioner was unable to do regular business. The Regional Commissioner determined that the petitioner's prospects for a resumption of successful business operations were well established. The petitioner was a fashion designer whose work had been featured in *Time* and *Look* magazines. Her clients included Miss Universe, movie actresses, and society matrons. The petitioner's clients had been included in the lists of the best-dressed California women. The petitioner lectured on fashion design at design and fashion shows throughout the United States and at colleges and universities in California. The Regional Commissioner's determination in *Sonegawa* was based in part on the petitioner's sound business reputation and outstanding reputation as a couturiere.

As in *Sonegawa*, USCIS may, at its discretion, consider evidence relevant to the petitioner's financial ability that falls outside of a petitioner's net income and net current assets. USCIS may consider such factors as the number of years the petitioner has been doing business, the established historical growth of the petitioner's business, the overall number of employees, the occurrence of any uncharacteristic business expenditures or losses, the petitioner's reputation within its industry, whether the beneficiary is replacing a former employee or an outsourced service, or any other evidence that USCIS deems relevant to the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage.

The AAO recognizes that the petitioner and its sister companies have been in business since 2001. Nevertheless, the evidence submitted does not reflect a pattern of significant growth or the occurrence of an uncharacteristic business expenditure or loss that would explain its inability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date. In addition, no evidence has been presented to show that the petitioner has a sound and outstanding business reputation as in *Sonegawa*. Unlike *Sonegawa*, the petitioner has not submitted any evidence reflecting the company's reputation or historical growth since its inception in 2001. Nor has it included any evidence or detailed explanation of the corporation's milestone achievements. As noted above, the record is generally devoid of evidence of [redacted] ability to pay the proffered wage. Thus, assessing the totality of the circumstances in this individual case, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the proffered wage.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.